FILED
JAN 26 1916
JAMES D. MAHER,
Clerk.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT

OF THE

UNITED STATES.

[redacted]

October Term, 1915.

No. 197.

Franklin Knight Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office,

Appellants,

vs.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,

Appellee.

BRIEF OF APPELLEE.

ALTON M. CATES,
RALPH S. ROUNDS,
HENRY P. BLAIR,
Attorneys for Appellee.

Parker & Stone Co., Law Printers, 332 West Fifth St., Los Angeles.

SUBJECT INDEX.

	PAGE
Statement of the Case	3
The Locality	4
Pueblo of Santa Rosa and Papago Pueblo Indians as Described in Bill of Complaint	4–10
History and Character of Papago Indians and Pueblos as Shown by the Authorities	11–23
Pueblo of Santa Rosa as Shown by the Authorities	23–25
The Legal Status of the Indians and Their Pueblos	26–36
Spanish Laws Regarding Indians, With Quotations	26–36
Mexican Laws After the Separation	36
Treaties of Cession	36–38
History Since 1853	38–39
Our Claim	39
The Aggressions of the Appellants	39–40
The Claim and Theory of the Government	40
POINT I.	
THE PUEBLO OF SANTA ROSA CAN SUE AS A JURIDICAL ENTITY IN THIS COURT	47
It Is a Corporation With Power to Sue Under the Statutes of Arizona	54

PAGE

It Was Either Created or Recognized as a Corporation by the Arizona State Constitution 54–55

It Was and Is a Corporation by Immemorial Prescription 55–57

The Corporate Character of Indian Pueblos Was Recognized by Spanish Law and Spanish and Mexican Statutes 58–61

New England Town Analogies..... 59–60

The Corporate Character of Indian and Spanish Pueblos Is Recognized by Our Courts 61–63

Indian Pueblos Were Created Corporations by New Mexican Legislation... 63

The Power of New Mexican Pueblos to Sue Is Recognized by the United States Courts and Papago Pueblos Have Same Power..... 64–65

POINT II.

THE PUEBLO OF SANTA ROSA HAS TITLE TO ITS LAND..... 65

By Spanish Laws and Decrees..... 65

By Prescription or Presumption of Lost Grant 65–71

By Legislative and Executive Action the United States Has Recognized Title of Pueblo Indians..... 72–75

PAGE

The Rights of the Pueblo of Santa Rosa Are Protected by International Law.. 75

The Presumption of Title Is in Favor of Pueblo Under United States Revised Statutes, Sec. 2126..... 75–76

Cases Recognizing That the New Mexican Pueblos Have Title..... 76

Communal Title of Indian Pueblos Is Recognized by American and Spanish Law 76

The Carino Case, 212 U. S. 449, Establishes the Plaintiff's Title..... 77–82

POINT III.

The Claim of the Pueblo of Santa Rosa Is Not Barred by Failure to Assert It Before Court of Private Land Claims or Before Land Commissioners 83–84

POINT IV.

Cases Relating to Indian Pueblos, Their Titles and Character of Their Inhabitants 85–95

POINT V.

The Pueblo Indians Are Citizens of the United States..... 95–97

POINT VI.

PAGE

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PAPAGO AND NORTH AMERICAN TRIBAL INDIANS 97–103

POINT VII.

INDIAN WARDSHIP HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE..... 104

The Doctrine of Indian Wardship.....104–106

Indian Wardship Is Not a Status or a Disability but Only a Congressional Power 106–107

Unless and Until Congress Acts, Indians Are Free and Unrestricted..... 107

Even if Papago Pueblos Are Wards of the Nation, That Fact Is Immaterial.107–109

POINT VIII.

THE PAPAGO RESERVATION ORDER OF JANUARY 14, 1916, IS IRRELEVANT AND UNIMPORTANT IN THIS CASE..... 110

But It Constitutes a New Threat of Encroachment and New Peril to the Indians 111

The Old Reservation Policy Is Generally Deemed as Degrading to the Indians. 113

The Allotment Policy Is Inapplicable to the Papagos 114–116

POINT IX.

PAGE

THE EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND LEGISLATION REGARDING PAPAGOS ARE IRRELEVANT AND UNIMPORTANT IN THIS CASE 117–120

POINT X.

THIS SUIT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ANY INTERFERENCE WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE APPELLANTS NOR IS IT A SUIT AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT NOR AN ACTION TO TRY TITLE TO LAND..... 120–121

POINT XI.

THIS COURT, IN THE EXERCISE OF ITS APPELLATE JURISDICTION, HAS POWER TO MAKE SUCH DISPOSITION OF THIS CASE AS JUSTICE MAY AT THIS TIME REQUIRE 122

LASTLY.

PAGE

On All Grounds the Decision Should Be for the Indians..... 122
To Recognize the Plaintiff's Rights Is Only Fair 123
To Recognize Their Rights Is Sensible.. 124
To Recognize Their Rights Is Best for the Indians, Protecting Them Against Encroachment, Promoting Their Development and Preserving Their Ancient Civilization 124–126
To Recognize Their Rights Is in Conformance With the Sound and Approved Indian Policy..... 127

LIST OF CASES.

PAGE OF BRIEF

Ainsa v. N. M. & Ariz. R. R. Co., 175 U. S. 76..... 83
Carino v. Insular Government of the Philippine Islands, 212 U. S. 449.... 77
City of Lynn v. Inhabitants of Nahant, 113 Mass. 433..... 60
Commonwealth v. Roxbury, 75 Mass. 451 59
Cherokee Nation v. Hitchcock, 187 U. S. 294 109
Crespin v. U. S., 168 U. S. 208, 218.... 67
Devine v. Los Angeles, 202 U. S. 313... 63

PAGE OF BRIEF

DeBaca v. Pueblo of Santo Domingo, 10 N. M. 38 64
Fletcher v. Fuller, 120 U. S. 534 71
Felix v. Patrick, 36 Fed. 457, 461 (affirmed 145 U. S. 317) 76, 109
Gauthier v. Morrison, 232 U. S. 452 ... 120
Governor v. Allen, 8 Hump. 176 57
Hill v. Boston, 122 Mass. 344, 349 60
Inhabitants of 4th School Dist. in Rumford v. Wood, 13 Mass. 193 60
Jaeger v. U. S. & The Yuma Indians, 29 Court of Claims 172 103
Knight v. The Land Association, 142 U. S. 161 62
Leitensdorfer v. Webb, 20 How. U. S. 176 54
Los Angeles Milling Co. v. Los Angeles, 217 U. S. 217 63
Laguna v. Acoma, 1 N. M. 220 64
Lane v. Watts, 234 U. S. 525 121
Merryman v. Bourne, 9 Wall. 592 ..... 62, 75
Nambe v. Romero, 10 N. M. 58 ..... 62, 64
Oaksmith v. Johnston, 92 U. S. 343 71
Ponce v. Roman Catholic Church, 210 U. S. 296 56
Pawlet v. Clark, 9 Cranch 292, 328 57
Porter v. Sullivan, 73 Mass. 441 60
Palmer v. Low, 98 U. S. 1 62
Penny v. Coke Company, 138 Fed. 769 (C. C. A.) 71
Pueblos of Santo Domingo and San Felipe v. U. S., 21 Sup. Ct. Rep. 915 .. 64
Richardson v. Ainsa, 218 U. S. 289 84

PAGE OF BRIEF

Re Kansas Indians, 72 U. S. 734..... 109
Spaulding v. City of Lowell, 40 Mass. 71-78 60
San Francisco v. U. S., Fed. Cases No. 12, 316 61
Sanchez v. Gonzalles, 11 Martin (La.) 207 67
Townsend v. Greeley, 5 Wall. 326..... 62
Territory of New Mexico v. Delinquent Tax Payers, 12 N. M. 139..... 62, 92
Terrett v. Taylor, 9 Cranch 43, 46..... 57
U. S. v. Pico, 5 Wall. 536..... 62
U. S. v. Lucero, 1 N. M. 422.62, 68, 73, 85, 97
U. S. v. Varela, 1 N. M. 593..... 62, 89
U. S. v. Joseph, 94 U. S. 614-619..... .....91, 96, 100, 108
U. S. v. Santa Fe, 165 U. S. 675, 710.. 67
U. S. v. Chavez, 159 U. S. 452, 464.... 70, 75
U. S. v. Chavez, 175 U. S. 509, 520... 70
U. S. v. Devereaux, 90 Fed. 182, 186 (C. C. A.)..... 71
U. S. v. Pendell, 185 U. S. 189..... 71
U. S. v. Botiller, 130 U. S. 238..... 83
U. S. v. Barker, 181 U. S. 481, 492.... 83, 84
U. S. v. Ritchie, 17 How. (U. S.) 525, 541 96
U. S. v. Sandoval, 231 U. S. 28..... 105
U. S. v. Conway, 175 U. S. 60..... 109
Victor de la O. v. Acoma, 1 N. M. 226.. 64
Watts, Watts and Company, L't'd., v. Unione Austriaca Di Navigacione, etc. (decided November 4, 1918), 1 U. S. Sp. Ct. Adv. Ops., 1..... 122
Zia v. U. S., 168 U. S. 198..... 64